

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tapto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/879,709	06/12/2001	Wade Summers	SUM.101	3775
24062 75	590 11/19/2003		EXAMI	INER
CAMORIANO & ASSOCIATES 8225 SHELBYVILLE ROAD LOUISVILLE, KY 40222		FISCHER, JUSTIN R		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1733	

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/879,709	SUMMERS, WADE
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Justin R Fischer	1733
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
HE REPLY FILED 27 October 2003 FAILS TO PLA herefore, further action by the applicant is required hal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be eithe nodition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of A kamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	to avoid abandonment of the er: (1) a timely filed amendm ppeal (with appeal fee); or (	is application. A proper reply to a nent which places the application in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or	b)]
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing d	ate of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY V.  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the short above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than thronged patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	tter than SIX MONTHS from the mail NAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH the date on which the petition under 3 extension and the corresponding am the past detailed the corresponding to the period for penty original the past detailed the penty original period for penty original the penty original period for penty original	ing date of the final rejection.  IS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  17 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee until set in the final Office action: or (2) as set forth
A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appel 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37	lant's Brief must be filed wit 7 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dis	hin the period set forth in smissal of the appeal.
. The proposed amendment(s) will not be enter-		
(a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require f		search (see NOTE below):
(a) ☐ they raise hew issues that would require (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see N		0001011 (000 110 1 = 0001),
(c) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see 1)  (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the applications issues for appeal; and/or	tion in better form for appea	l by materially reducing or simplifying
(d) they present additional claims without ca	ancelina a correspondina nu	mber of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.	, ,	
. Applicant's reply has overcome the following	rejection(s):	
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) w canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	vould be allowable if submitt	ed in a separate, timely filed amendme
.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) reque application in condition for allowance because	est for reconsideration has b e: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	een considered but does NOT place the
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considere raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		SOLELY to issues which were newly
. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amend explanation of how the new or amended clair	ment(s) a)⊠ will not be entons would be rejected is prov	ered or b) will be entered and an ided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as foli		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to: 15 and 18-21.		
Claim(s) objected to: <u>175 this 16 21</u> .  Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14 and 17</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	:	
B. The drawing correction filed on is a)	- approved or b)☐ disappr	oved by the Examiner.
Note the attached Information Disclosure State		

Application/Control Number: 09/879,709

Art Unit: 1733

- (C • , , , ,

Continuation of 2: As set forth in the previous Advisory Action, the language "at least some of the balls are independent of said tire and rim..." was not required by the claims prior to the Final Rejection. This newly added limitation requires further search and consideration and as such, the after final amendment is not being entered. It is emphasized that the previously drafted claims never identified the circumferential movement of the respective balls upon puncture of a given ball- the claims only required a plurality of inflated balls having a diameter that spans the tire cavity.

Continuation of 5: As set forth in the Final Rejection, the prior art references of record recognize the use of inflatable balls that span the diameter of a tire cavity, wherein such an assembly is described as being usable with any standard/common rim construction. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to use a conventional, safety rim with an "inflatable ball" assembly since safety rims are extensively used in the manufacture of modern tire constructions. It is emphasized that rim technology has significantly changed since the time at which the "inflatable ball" assemblies were described by the prior art references of record- thus, in adapting the "inflatable ball" assembly to a modern day tire and in view of the prior art recognizing the use of any standard/common rim construction, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have looked to current tire technology, including a conventional safety rim.

Regarding the declaration, the declaration is untimely and will not be considered because good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented have not been shown.

<u>Continuation of 9:</u> The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on October 27, 2003 was filed after the mailing date of the Final Rejection on June 26, 2003. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Justin Fischer

November 17, 2003

JEFF H. AFTERGUT PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1300